

### Amendments to the Drawings

**Fig. 1** has been amended to correct a typographical error at **120**, replacing “Domain Name” with “DomainName” (and thereby aligning with the corresponding text on p. 27, line 6 of the Specification).

**Fig. 6B** has been amended to correct a typographical error at **650**, adding quotation marks within the parenthesized text.

No new matter is introduced.

## **REMARKS**

The Specification has been amended. Claims 5 - 7, 9, and 15 - 17 have been amended (and these amendments are not made in view of the cited art). No new matter has been introduced with these amendments, all of which are supported in the application as originally filed. Claims 1 - 17 remain in the application.

Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as arguments and claim amendments in the present application are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of the currently-presented claims at an early date. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

### **I. Proposed Replacement Drawings**

Proposed replacement drawings are provided herewith for **Figs. 1** and **6B**, as discussed above in “Amendments to the Drawings”. No new matter has been introduced with these proposed replacement drawings.

### **II. Objection to the Claims**

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action dated October 5, 2007 (hereinafter, “the Office Action”) states that Claims 7 - 10 “are objected to for a minor informality”. Office Action, paragraph 2,

line 1. Applicant has addressed this objection by amendment herein (effectively reversing the order of Claims 5 and 6 as originally filed), and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

### III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 6 and 8 - 17 (which Applicant notes should read “9 - 17”) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by “Resource Description Framework (RDF) Model and Syntax Specification” (hereinafter, “RDF Syntax”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, “Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the disclosure in a single piece of prior art of each and every limitation of a claimed invention.” *Apple Computer Inc. v. Articulate Sys. Inc.*, 57 U.S.P.Q.2d 1057, 1061 (Fed. Cir. 2000), emphasis added. In another case, the Court of Appeals stated that a finding of anticipation requires that there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the disclosure of the cited reference as viewed by one of ordinary skill in the art. See *Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In yet another case, the Court of Appeals held that a finding of anticipation requires absolute identity for each and every element set forth in the claimed invention. See *Trintec Indus. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 63 U.S.P.Q.2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

Referring first to independent Claim 1, this claim recites:

A method of uniquely identifying resources, comprising steps of:  
modeling the resources using a hierarchical schema, wherein classes in the schema correspond to resource types and wherein instances in the schema represent individual resources, each instance being associated with one of the classes according to the resource type of the individual resource represented by the instance; and

defining, at a topmost class of the hierarchical schema, a naming rule property and an instance identity property, wherein:

each class at levels of the hierarchical schema beneath the topmost level inherits the naming rule property and the instance identity property;

a value of the naming rule property for a selected class identifies properties of the selected class that enable instances of the selected class to have unique identities; and

an instance of the selected class specifies the unique identity for that instance, using the identified properties for the selected class. (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that RDF Syntax fails to teach, or suggest, at least the above-underlined recitations of Claim 1, as will now be discussed.

The claim element on lines 6 - 7 of Claim 1 recites “defining, at a topmost class of the hierarchical schema, a naming rule property and an instance identity property” (emphasis added).

With regard to this claim element, the Office Action cites RDF Syntax, section 2.2, paragraph 2, “XML rules”. Office Action, para. 4, lines 14 - 15. Applicant does not fully understand what is implied by the quoted “XML rules” in this citation, but nonetheless, Applicant finds no teaching, or any suggestion, in this cited paragraph of a “naming rule property”, or of an “instance identity property”, or of “defining” such properties “at a topmost class of the hierarchical schema”.

With regard to the “each class ... *inherits* the naming rule property and the instance identity property” claim element recited at lines 8 - 9 of Claim 1 (emphasis added), the Office

Action cites RDF Syntax, section 1, paragraph 5. Office Action, para. 4, lines 16 - 18. Applicant respectfully submits that this cited paragraph has no teaching, or any suggestion, of inheriting a “naming rule property” or an “instance identity property”.

With regard to the claim element recited on lines 10 - 11 of Claim 1, “a value of the naming rule property for a selected class identifies properties of the selected class that enable instances of the selected class to have unique identities” (emphasis added), the Office Action cites RDF Syntax, section 2.1.1, “below figure 2”. Office Action, page 4, lines 1 - 3. Applicant is unable to determine exactly what is encompassed within “below figure 2”. Nonetheless, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the text on the page containing Fig. 2 teaches, or suggests, a “*naming rule* property” or a “value” of such property, or that such value “identifies properties of the selected class ...” – and in addition, that such naming rule property is “define[d] at a topmost class of the hierarchical schema” and inherited by “each class ... beneath the topmost level” – in contrast to the claim element recited on lines 10 - 11 of Applicant’s Claim 1 and its antecedents found in lines 6 - 9 of Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner identify the particular portion of RDF Syntax that is relied on as teaching a “naming rule property”, as well as the particular portion of RDF Syntax that is relied on as teaching that a value of this *naming rule property* “identifies properties of the selected class that enable instances of the selected class to have unique identities”, which Applicant has claimed on lines 10 - 11 of Claim 1 (emphasis added). Because such information has not been provided in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that

any continuing disagreement between Applicant and the Examiner as to whether or not particular claimed features of Applicant's invention are disclosed by RDF Syntax is a direct result of a lack of specificity by the Examiner in the rejection as presented in the Office Action.

Finally, referring to the claim element recited on lines 12 - 13 of Applicant's Claim 1, "an instance of the selected class specifies the unique identity for that instance, using the identified properties for the selected class" (emphasis added), the Office Action cites RDF Syntax, section 1, paragraph 5. Office Action, page 4, lines 4 - 6. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this analysis. Notably, the "using the identified properties ..." claim language on line 13 of Claim 1 has its antecedent on lines 10 - 11, which recite that "a value of the naming rule property ..." identifies these properties. As Applicant has stated above, Applicant finds no teaching, or suggestion, in the cited text of any "naming rule property", or that a value thereof "identifies properties of the selected class ...". It therefore follows that RDF Syntax also does not teach, or suggest, using such "identified properties" as claimed by Applicant on lines 12 - 13 of Claim 1.

Accordingly, as demonstrated above, differences exist between RDF Syntax and Applicant's claimed invention as recited in Claim 1, and thus RDF Syntax does not anticipate Claim 1 according to the holding in *Scripps Clinic*. Applicant also respectfully submits that the above-provided discussions demonstrate that RDF Syntax fails to disclose each and every limitation of independent Claim 1, and thus RDF Syntax does not anticipate Claim 1 according to the holding in *Apple Computer Inc.* Stated another way, it can be seen that absolute identity is not found in the RDF Syntax disclosure for each and every element of Claim 1, and thus RDF

Syntax does not anticipate Claim 1 according to the holding in *Trintec Indus.*

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 is patentable over RDF Syntax. Dependent Claims 2 - 14 are deemed patentable over RDF Syntax by virtue of at least the allowability of independent Claim 1, from which they depend.

Referring next to independent Claim 15, the Office Action discusses the final claim element of this claim, and then states “For the remaining steps [sic] of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.”. Office Action, page 6, lines 10 - 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the arguments presented above with regard to Claim 1, demonstrating that RDF Syntax does not anticipate Claim 1, apply equally to the claim elements of independent Claim 15. Claim 15 is therefore deemed patentable over RDF Syntax.

With regard to independent Claims 16 and 17, the Office Action refers to the “remarks and discussions made in claim 15” and the “remarks and discussions made in claim 1”, respectively. Office Action, page 6, line 16 - page 7, line 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the arguments presented above with regard to Claim 1, as also applied to Claim 15, apply equally to claim elements of independent Claims 16 and 17. Claims 16 and 17 are therefore deemed patentable over RDF Syntax.

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §102

rejection.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action states that Claims 7 - 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over RDF Syntax in view of “RDF Vocabulary Description Language 1.0: RDF Schema” (hereinafter, “RDF Schema”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has demonstrated, above, that RDF Syntax does anticipate Claim 1. The cited RDF Schema fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of RDF Syntax. Dependent Claims 7 - 8 are therefore deemed patentable by virtue of at least the patentability of independent Claim 1 from which they depend.

The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection.

V. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of all claims at an early date.



Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/

Marcia L. Doubet,  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 40,999

Cust. Nbr. for Correspondence: 43168

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-343-7587

Attachment: Replacement Drawings (2)